

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/656,552	556,552 09/05/2003		Martina Fitz	J&J-1975 DIV	8177	
27777	7590	12/07/2005		EXAMINER		
PHILIP S.	JOHNSC	N	GOFF II, JOHN L			
JOHNSON	& JOHNS	ON				
ONE JOHN	SON & JO	OHNSON PLAZA	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
NEW BRUI	NSWICK,	NJ 08933-7003	1733			

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				//
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	-v
		10/656,552	FITZ, MARTINA	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		John L. Goff	1733	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Se</u>	eptember 2003.		
·	<i>,</i> —	action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar			
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5) 6) 7)	Claim(s) 33-42 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) 33-42 are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the bedrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
3) 🔲 Inform	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/656,552 Page 2

Art Unit: 1733

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 33-41, drawn to a method of producing a handling aid, classified in class
   264, subclass 299.
- II. Claim 42, drawn to a method of using a handling aid, classified in class 53, subclass 396.
- 2. Inventions I and II are related as independent inventions, each having a unique and separate means for establishing patentability. Invention I is directed to a method of producing a handling aid whereas Invention II is directed to a method of using a handling aid. Invention I does not require the use as detailed by Invention II and Invention II does not require the formation as detailed in Invention I.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

In the event Group I is elected applicant is required to elect one of the following Species:

**Species I** (appears to read on claims 33-35) directed to producing the handling aid by coating.

**Species II** (appears to read on claims 36-41) directed to producing the handling aid by thermal bonding.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there are no generic claims.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Art Unit: 1733

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. A telephone call was made to applicants representative on 11/17/05 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made as the examiner was unable to reach applicants representative.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **John L. Goff** whose telephone number is (571) 272-1216. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:15 AM - 3:45 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John L. Goff

JEFF H: AFTERGUT PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300